

ARCHITECTURE Undergraduate and Graduate Program Assessment Plan

Department of Architecture, School of Architecture and Environment, College of Design

Learning Goals and Objectives

Because our professionally accredited programs, Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch.) and Master of Architecture (M.Arch.) both must address the Student Performance Criteria (SPC) defined by the National Architecture Accreditation Board (NAAB) <http://www.naab.org>, we will assess learning for both programs in parallel. The following learning goals, extracted from the 26 SPC in the NAAB 2014 Conditions for Accreditation are areas that we have targeted for improvement (A.1, A.7) or criteria commonly not met in the NAAB Analysis of 2016 Visiting Team Reports for Continuing and Initial Accreditation (B.2, B.3 and C.3). http://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2016-Report-on-Accreditation-in-Architecture-part-III_final.pdf

A.1 Professional Communication Skills: Ability to write and speak effectively and use representational media appropriate for both within the profession and with the general public

A.7 History and Global Culture: Understanding of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, ecological, and technological factors.

B.2. Site Design: Ability to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation, in the development of a project design.

B.3. Codes and Regulations: Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems that are responsive to relevant codes and regulations, and include the principles of life-safety and accessibility standards.

C.3 Integrative Design: Ability to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

Assessment Methods

By what measure(s) will you know that students are meeting departmental learning objectives? How will learning outcomes be assessed (rubrics, test questions, portfolios, etc.)? From whom, and at what points, will you gather data? Note that not every student needs to be assessed – you can sample student work. How will the information be collected?

In order to maintain our accreditation as a professional architecture program, we submit annual statistical reports and are periodically visited by an external accreditation team. The team reviews B.Arch. and M.Arch. student work for compliance in teaching SPC's. We received an 8-year approval in 2013, and addressed issues in interim accreditation reports in 2015 and 2018. We are starting to prepare for our next accreditation visit in Spring 2021, by creating a digital filing system to gather course syllabi, handouts and student work. Our program context, faculty profiles and curriculum will be summarized in our Architecture Program Report written in 2019- 20, submitted Fall 2020. Accreditation

reviewers take each Student Performance Criteria and review sample work from each relevant class for compliance.

Every quarter in week 10, we engage in informal peer reviews of teaching. All our faculty are required publicly review the student projects from each other's architectural design studios, the classes that are the core of our curriculum. The design studios are 12 hour per week classes in which architecture students are given a particular design problem on which to apply and integrate the skills and knowledge learned in other classes. (These courses are taught like tutorials: faculty members work directly with an individual student or teams of students to develop a comprehensive design solution to this problem.) The reviews are generally four-hour long open sessions in which the students pin-up and/or project the fruits of their efforts and receive either individual or group feedback from professors and external guest design critics.

At the time of the final design reviews, the teachers of our co-taught core studios consult with each other and the department head about marginal and failing students, and often discuss how to improve the class. By touring through the review pin-ups, the department head informally assesses design studio instruction quality and can provide brief feedback to instructors. Because the final review sessions provide an in-depth insight into the design problem, approaches and solution, we try to assign teachers scheduled to do a peer review of teaching to the appropriate final design review.

For each Student Performance Criteria (SPC), we will look at how the student work from the noted courses meets the SPC and related course objectives. We will examine the work at the end of each term, in final design review, through our digital accreditation filing system or through a course website (i.e. <http://blogs.uoregon.edu/222s18>). The following required courses correspond to the identified SPC's:

A.1 Professional Communication Skills: 202 Design Skills, 222 Arch Computer Graphics, 611 Graduate Design Process & 622 Grad Arch Computer Graphics, Arch 4/584 Architectural Design

A.7 History and Global Culture: 610 Global Architecture in the Modern Era, 4/530 Architectural Contexts

B.2. Site Design: 384 Intermediate Architectural Design II, 682 Graduate Design Studio II (building in the landscape), 683 Intro Graduate Design Studio

B.3. Codes and Regulations: 383 Intermediate Architectural Design I and 681 Graduate Design Studio (Urban infill building), 683 Intro Graduate Design Studio

C.3 Integrative Design: 4/586 Advanced Architectural Design II

Assessment Processes

For each year's area of assessment, we will use final reviews, the accreditation filing system or the course website (when available) to examine low, median and strong student work for the relevant classes. We will review them against the chosen Student Performance Criteria and related course objectives. Our Design Review Committee will look for compliance with the criteria and use them for self-assessment and discussion about improvements with the departmental leaders and the relevant faculty.

Learning Objective	AY 18-19	AY 19-20	AY 20-21 Accreditation Visit	AY 21-22*	AY 22-23*
A.1 Professional Communication Skills		X	Revisit		
A.7 History and Global Culture	X		Revisit		
B.2. Site Design			X		Revisit
B.3. Codes and Regulations	X		Revisit	Revisit	
C.3 Integrative Design		X	Revisit		

*Subject to change

Status, Outcomes and Results

We will use monthly faculty meetings to report and discuss the assessment findings with the whole faculty, then work in smaller groups of relevant faculty to develop ways to move forward. For example, our Curriculum Committee has created many documents about revising our visual communications teaching with a concrete result that Prof. Daisy Williams developed a program of Media Coaches who tutor students on a variety of drawing and digital architectural representation skills. In Winter 2019, and we will be engaging in discussions with the Landscape Architecture and Interior Architecture faculty to merge our efforts in teaching visual communications, so it is relevant that we would look at this in 2019-20.

Decisions, Plans and Recommendations

Requirements that affect most of the faculty (such as code compliance) should be reviewed in faculty meetings, with all taking place on brainstorming solutions. For those areas primarily affecting a subset of faculty, relevant faculty will be assigned as a work group with a specific time frame to develop ways to address deficiencies. The Design Review Committee would follow up on monitoring progress, and if coursework adjustments are required, then the Curriculum Committee would refine a proposal.

Departmental leadership will be in charge of reviewing progress as a whole.

Nancy Cheng, Department Head

December 14, 2018